

## The College at Brockport: State University of New York Digital Commons @Brockport

---

### Appointment, Promotion, and Tenure Documentation

---

2014

# Nursing: Appointment, Promotion, and Tenure Documentation

The College at Brockport

Follow this and additional works at: <http://digitalcommons.brockport.edu/apt>



Part of the [Higher Education Commons](#)

---

### Repository Citation

The College at Brockport, "Nursing: Appointment, Promotion, and Tenure Documentation" (2014). *Appointment, Promotion, and Tenure Documentation*. 80.

<http://digitalcommons.brockport.edu/apt/80>

This Document is brought to you for free and open access by Digital Commons @Brockport. It has been accepted for inclusion in Appointment, Promotion, and Tenure Documentation by an authorized administrator of Digital Commons @Brockport. For more information, please contact [kmyers@brockport.edu](mailto:kmyers@brockport.edu).



The College at  
**BROCKPORT**  
STATE UNIVERSITY OF NEW YORK

**DEPARTMENT OF NURSING**

**GUIDELINES  
FOR  
PERSONNEL EVALUATIONS**

## **Table of Contents**

	<b>Page</b>
<b>College Guideline on Tenure and Promotion</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>Uniqueness of the Nursing Program</b>	<b>4</b>
Teaching	
Scholarship	
Service	
<b>Academic and Experience Justifying Rank</b>	<b>9</b>
<b>Criteria and Procedures for Single-Year Evaluations</b>	<b>11</b>
Teaching Effectiveness: Single-year evaluation	
Scholarship: Single-year evaluation	
Service: Single-year evaluation	
<b>Procedures for Discretionary Salary Increase (DSI) Consideration</b>	<b>22</b>
<b>Multi-Year Evaluation Material for Contract Renewal (QAR)</b>	<b>23</b>
<b>Multi-Year Evaluation Material for Tenure Tract Faculty</b>	<b>24</b>
<b>Process: Overview of Application &amp; Review for Reappointment, Continuing Appointment, Promotion</b>	<b>27</b>
<b>Guidelines for Promotion to the Rank of Associate Professor (with tenure, as appropriate)</b>	<b>29</b>
<b>Guidelines for Promotion to the Rank of Professor</b>	<b>32</b>
<b>Procedure for Adjunct Faculty Review</b>	<b>35</b>
<b>References</b>	<b>36</b>

**The following paragraph is taken from the *Faculty Guide* in relation to the College Guideline on Tenure and Promotion:**

Departmental APT documents are explicit in describing the guidelines for evaluating teaching and the expected teaching loads for the department, the kinds of scholarship considered appropriate to the discipline and the quantity and quality measures used in determining appropriate scholarship for rank, and the department's system of weighting the relative importance of teaching, scholarship and service (although as a general rule, teaching must always be weighed at least 50%, and scholarship must be weighed more heavily than service). Of course, departments can only make personnel recommendations. Ultimately, only the College President (in consultation with the school deans and academic VP) makes personnel decisions. These department APT documents are reviewed and approved by the deans and the Provost & Vice President for Academic Affairs. Accordingly, they represent the minimum guidelines agreed to by College Administration in making these decisions. *The guidelines in these departmental documents describe a set of minimal (necessary) performance expectations. They should not be construed, however, as explicating a set of criteria that are sufficient for a positive recommendation.* Minimal expectations will be taken into consideration as part of a thorough and comprehensive evaluation of the candidate's professional performance and contributions. Furthermore, the comprehensive evaluation should consider both retrospective and prospective points of view, including, for instance, the candidate's potential for achieving and/or performing at, the highest academic rank.

## UNIQUENESS OF THE NURSING PROGRAM

The central mission of the Department of Nursing is to prepare a professional nurse who can meet the health care needs of a culturally diverse society. The department of nursing (DON) has seven student learning outcomes (SLOs) that students must achieve by the completion of the program. The DON also has several outcomes that are measured at graduation and at intervals after graduation that help determine if teaching and learning have been successful and if employers are confident in our graduates.

Nursing faculty believe in an integrated approach to nursing education. The faculty operate with a common goal expressed by our philosophy and student learning outcomes. This close team relationship requires mutual trust and respect among faculty members. Each faculty member is responsible for creating and utilizing teaching approaches which reflect the departmental philosophy and the SLOs of the program. Teaching, scholarship, and service are interrelated faculty activities.

### **TEACHING**

Nursing education has its primary focus on two teaching objectives:

- 1) to impart the theoretical and practical knowledge that underlies nursing practice and role development;
- 2) to provide students with opportunities to apply theory to the direct care of patients in a variety of health care settings.

The nature of materials related to teaching consists of varied student assignments and direct supervision of students in the clinical setting. Learning opportunities include classroom teaching, clinical teaching and supervision, role modeling, seminar, teaching of skills in the laboratory, supervising directed studies, advising, and precepting students.

Faculty need to maintain a clinical practice to remain clinical competent and current and this enhances the quality of teaching. Faculty must be involved in clinical practice activities to meet expectations for maintaining licensing requirements and to remain a role model to the students. Clinical practice may include independent practice, consultation, certification in a specialty area, direct care of patients in a health care setting, and continuing education beyond that which is mandatory for licensure.

Health care is ever changing and curricula must reflect best evidence based practices. Clinical nursing is a unique teaching in contrast to the traditional classroom or science lab. Clinical faculty are legally accountable for the delivery of all patient care by students. Nursing faculty are at clinical sites with students at varying hours and often during life and death situations. Nursing faculty members must accompany nursing students to clinical and directly supervise their practice. It is unpredictable, emotional, stressful and ever changing.

Clinical teaching creates unique challenges for nursing faculty including: interactions with students, clients/families, and staff from health care agencies; safety concerns for all those involved; isolation from other faculty; legal liability; and accountability to the public and health care facilities. Agencies where nursing faculty supervise students have their own credentialing requirements for nursing faculty, which further increases the time commitment on the part of nursing faculty in maintaining competency in the clinical settings.

The clinical component of nursing education is a major teaching commitment and workload

for nursing faculty. Affiliating agencies limit faculty/student ratios to 1:5 - 1:8. Nursing faculty are in clinical a minimum of 12 to 14 hours a week directly supervising nursing students. Faculty need daily preparation time for clinical supervision which includes organizing client assignments, reviewing care plans, medications, treatments and discharge plans, and arriving at clinical site before students in order to check assignments. After the actual 12 to 14 hours of clinical, additional time is necessary for anecdotal notes, correction of written work, writing evaluations, and the development of clinical opportunities and follow-up with on-site preceptors and clients.

Effective teaching also includes activities that promote effective learning environments. These activities include revision of current and the addition of new teaching activities, lectures and exams and evaluation and revision of the curriculum to ensure it remains current. Effective teaching also includes: reading of professional journals and textbooks, attendance at conferences and workshops, and involvement in practice settings to maintain proficiency and currency of subject matter in the discipline.

Achievement of the program SLOs measured by a minimum of all graduating students having earned a:

- a final grade of C (75%) in all nursing courses, and satisfactory completion of clinical objectives.
- very good to excellent ratings on program evaluation by students at graduation, and at 8 and 20 months after graduation.
- graduate employment rate of at least 90% within six months of program completion.
- very good to excellent ratings from employers about graduate performance.
- annual NCLEX-RN pass rates above the state and national mean score.

## **SCHOLARSHIP**

**According to the Position Statement on Defining Scholarship for the Discipline of Nursing (AACN, 1999), there are four different types of scholarship. These expand upon the work of Boyer (1990):**

- **Scholarship of Discovery**
- **Scholarship of Teaching**
- **Scholarship of Application**
- **Scholarship of Integration**

**It is our faculty's belief that all four types of scholarship are imperative to the practice of nursing and to the growth of the profession of nursing**

The Association of Colleges of Nursing (AACN) (1999) defines Scholarship in Nursing as "...those activities that systematically advance the teaching, research, and practice of nursing through rigorous inquiry that is 1) significant to the profession, 2) creative, 3) can be documented, 4) can be replicated or elaborated, and 5) can be peer-reviewed.

Nursing faculty who maintain a 3/3 teaching load, are expected to have an active scholarship program. An active program of scholarship for nursing faculty includes ongoing efforts at improving teaching, learning, or practice, as defined under primary and secondary products. Faculty who do not demonstrate an active program of scholarship *will* contribute more in teaching (4/4) or in service.

### **Scholarship of Discovery**

According to the AACN position statement, “the scholarship of discovery is the inquiry that produces the disciplinary and professional knowledge that is at the very heart of academic pursuits” (AACN, 1999). The scholarship of discovery may take many different forms of research, for example, primary empirical research, methodological studies, historical research, theory development and testing, and philosophical inquiry and analysis. The AACN Position Statement clearly describes these different types of scholarship of discovery.

This position statement also provides examples of such scholarship such as:

- peer-reviewed publications of research, theory, or philosophical essays;
- peer-reviewed presentations of research, theory, or philosophical essays;
- grant awards in support of research or scholarship;
- mentorship of junior colleagues in research or scholarship which results in a peer-reviewed product;
- state, regional, national, or international recognition as a scholar in an identified area; and
- positive peer evaluations accomplished

### **Scholarship of Teaching**

The scholarship of teaching is inquiry that produces knowledge to support the transfer of the science and art of nursing from the expert to the novice, building bridges between the teacher's understanding and the student's learning (AACN, 1999). This position statement clearly outlines and describes the ways in which the scholarship of teaching is conducted as through application of knowledge of the discipline or specialty area in the teaching-learning process, the development of innovative teaching and evaluation methods, program development, learning outcome evaluation, and professional role modeling. This position statement also provides such examples of the documentation of the scholarship of teaching as

- peer-reviewed publications of research related to teaching methodology or learning outcomes, case studies related to teaching-learning, learning theory development, and development or testing of educational models or theories;
- accreditation or other comprehensive program reports;
- successful applications of technology to teaching and learning;
- positive peer assessments of innovations in teaching;
- state, regional, national, or international recognition as a master teacher;
- published textbooks or other learning aids;
- grant awards in support of teaching and learning;
- design of outcome studies or evaluation/assessment programs; and
- presentations related to teaching and learning.

**For these examples of scholarship of teaching to apply at The College at Brockport, there must be demonstration that the above products are peer reviewed.**

### **Scholarship of Application**

Nursing faculty may engage in the scholarship of application by advanced clinical practice, staff development at clinical sites, clinical problem solving, and consultation work. The scholarship of application is discipline specific and may not result in a product in the traditional sense of the word, but may result in products that allow for practice application such as developing policies, practice protocols, or manuals. For the purpose of APT validation, this must be documented by a letter of support from someone who has benefited from the product. This is important scholarship as identified by Boyer (1990).

According to the AACN Position Statement on Defining Scholarship for the Discipline of Nursing, "Practice is conducted through the application of nursing and related knowledge to the assessment and validation of patient care outcomes, the measurement of quality of life indicators, the development and refinement of practice protocols/strategies, the evaluation of systems of care, and the analysis of innovative health care delivery models (AACN, 1999)."

### **The scholarship of nursing practice may be demonstrated in the following ways:**

1. **Certification.** This is a significant component within advanced nursing practice as it attests to the knowledge of established standards of practice within a nursing specialty.
2. **Development of clinical knowledge.** Many nursing academicians are immersed in evidence based practice and expert consensus driven primary and specialty clinical practice arenas to meet the health care needs of individuals, families, communities and populations.
3. **Professional development.** A minimum of 25 continuing education hours per year is generally required by health care systems in order to practice. Certification bodies require a range of 25 to 50 continuing education credits per year in order to maintain certification.
4. **Application of technical skills.** Acquiring new clinical skills by the nurse academician promotes comprehensive health care, but also supports teaching and learning.
5. **Peer reviews of practice.** Peer reviews of practicing nurses support responsibility and commitment to scholarship.
6. **Presentations related to practice.** Expertise that nurses have in their specialty area of practice area are presented in poster and podium presentations, as well as hospital staff development workshops.
7. **Case studies.** Published case studies providing clinical situations which are shared with the nursing population through publication in peer-reviewed journals.
8. **Establishing Academic-Service Partnerships.** The nursing profession is positioned to reshape interdependent health care processes and academic systems with the establishment of academic-health organization partnerships.



9. **Reports compiling and analyzing client programs/ health outcomes.** Written analysis of health care practice and service outcomes may provide suggestions for change in practice which will reshape health care.
10. **Consultation reports.** Evaluation of other Schools of Nursing curricula.
11. **Dissemination of research findings for public awareness.** This information may influence public policy matters, legislation, and health care reimbursement.
12. **Model Program Implementation.** The development and implementation of evidence based clinical programs in practice settings maybe shared with others through published manuscripts.

### **Scholarship of Integration**

According to the AACN Position Statement on Defining Scholarship for the Discipline of Nursing (1999), the Scholarship of Integration “writings and other products that use concepts and original works from nursing and other disciplines in creating new patterns, placing knowledge in a larger context, or illuminating the data in a more meaningful way. The scholarship of integration emphasizes the interconnection of ideas, and brings new insight to bear on original concepts and research”. The Scholarship of Integration occurs when nursing interacts with other disciplines to complete analysis of health policy, development of interdisciplinary educational programs and service projects, integrative reviews of the literature, and integrative models or paradigms across disciplines. The position statement lists the following as examples of the integrative scholarship:

- peer-reviewed publications of research, policy analysis, case studies, integrative reviews of the literature, and others;
- copyrights, licenses, patents, or products for sale;
- published books;
- positive peer evaluations of contributions to integrative scholarship;
- reports of interdisciplinary programs or service projects;
- interdisciplinary grant awards;
- presentations; and
- policy papers designed to influence organizations or governments.

Tenured faculty who engage in nursing research, as described above, will be required to cover a teaching load of 3/3. Those faculty who do not demonstrate an active scholarship program or traditional research will contribute more in teaching (4/4 teaching load). Faculty who assume significant departmental administrative assignments of Level Coordinator, RN to BSN Director, or Director of the BS to BSN program will be considered exempt from a 4/4 teaching load.

Faculty who have active scholarship programs may have grant awards that augment their salary. In this case, teaching loads will be adjusted depending on the grant support for research and faculty salary.

## **SERVICE**

Nursing is a service-oriented profession. Nursing faculty believe that service includes a number of activities that benefit the department, the college, the community, and the profession. Within the college and in the community, health care providers and consumers require nursing faculty to meet health care and health education needs. Service activities within the Department of Nursing support the overarching institutional mission, and the mission of the profession of nursing.

Areas of service involvement are not limited to but include:

### **Advisement:**

Faculty are very active in advisement. Faculty participate in all college organized advisement activities and advise all nursing majors. They also advise freshman and Sophomore "Intents to Major", interested transfer students, registered nurses, second degree students, and campus visitors.

### **Department Governance**

Departmental governance is influenced by state and federal regulatory agencies, accrediting bodies, and standards of professional education. These constituencies place exceptional demands on faculty time, committee structure, and curriculum implementation and evaluation.

### **Student/Departmental Support**

Other service activities include promoting student employment through writing letters of recommendation, developing and maintaining the department's web page, participating in departmental, school, college and university governance, and engaging in discipline/ college specific community work.

### **Professional Associations**

Membership and/or leadership in professional associations are an expectation for nursing faculty. Nursing faculty are members of The American Nurses Association as well as maintain membership in specialty organizations in which they practice. In addition, nursing faculty represent the profession in community committees and advisory boards.

### **College-Wide Service**

Nursing faculty also serve on committees that support college governance and structure. Faculty are active in college-wide committees, grade appeal committees, and faculty senate.

## **ACADEMIC & EXPERIENCE JUSTIFYING RANK**

Faculty hired into the Department of Nursing will earn the title of Clinical Assistant Professor, Visiting Assistant Professor, Assistant Professor, Associate Professor, or Professor based on education and experience. All faculty are expected to have a master's degree in nursing in the specialty area for which the appointee is to carry major teaching/clinical responsibility.

### **Clinical Assistant Professor (Lecturer)**

- An appointee to the rank of Clinical Assistant Professor (Lecturer) will have a master's degree in nursing and have practiced as a registered nurse for a minimum of two years. This person will be considered a Qualified Academic Rank (QAR).
- QAR faculty are not required to participate in scholarship and are required to teach a 4/4 load, unless they are engaged in significant administrative service to the department as level coordinator or director of a nursing program.
- Service to the department is an expectation of this rank.

### **Visiting Assistant Professor**

- An appointee to the rank of Visiting Assistant Professor will have a master's degree in nursing, and enrolled in a doctoral program in nursing or a related field,
- Have practiced as a registered nurse for a minimum of two years,
- Teaching experience is preferred.

### **Assistant Professor**

- An appointee to the rank of Assistant Professor will have a doctoral degree in nursing (PhD, DNS, DNP), or a doctoral degree in a related field,
- A minimum of two years of didactic teaching in an accredited university or college,
- Maintain clinical competence in the area of expertise.
- Demonstrate a beginning program of scholarship.

### **Associate Professor**

- An appointee to the rank of Associate Professor will have a doctoral degree in nursing (PhD, DNS, DNP), or a doctoral degree in a related field,
- A minimum of six years of didactic teaching at the rank of Assistant Professor,
- Maintain clinical competence in the area of expertise.
- Maintain a program of scholarship.

### **Professor**

- An appointee to the rank of Professor will have a doctoral degree in nursing (PhD, DNS, DNP), or a doctoral degree in a related field,
- A minimum of eleven years of didactic teaching, including a minimum of five years at the rank of Associate Professor,
- Maintain clinical competence in the area of expertise.
- Maintain a program of scholarship.

The remainder of the Nursing Department APT Document is divided into two main sections. The first section to assist faculty in one-year evaluations, and the second section is to assist the faculty member with contract renewals, tenure, and promotion.

## Single Year Evaluation Material

### Criteria and Procedures for Single-Year Evaluations

The four departments within the School of Health and Human Performance have agreed to a systematic evaluation of faculty using a 5-point rubric system. This rubric template is tied to the notion of below, at rank, and above rank. The rubrics contain different criteria which have been established by each department appropriate for the particular discipline. This one-year evaluation will be used by the chair of the department and the APT Committee for faculty annual evaluations, for DSI procedures, and for other evaluations required.

#### School of Health & Human Performance

##### Sample Rubric Template

##### Single Year Evaluation

5	Above Rank	A score of 5 indicates a level of performance that is significantly above that which ordinarily is expected for a faculty member at a particular rank.
4	Above Rank	A score of 4 indicates a level of performance above that which is expected for a faculty member at a particular rank.
3	At Rank	A score of 3 indicates a level of performance that is ordinarily expected for a faculty member at a particular rank. (Over <u>multiple years</u> , it is expected that faculty members at a particular rank would “average” a score of 3 for a specific faculty role.)
2	At Rank	A score of 2 indicates a minimally acceptable level of performance for a particular academic rank <u>in a single year</u> . Faculty who score a 2 for one of the faculty roles are eligible to be considered for a DSI for performance in other faculty roles. (Over <u>multiple years</u> , faculty who “average” a score of 2 generally would not be considered to be performing “at rank” for that specific faculty role.)
1	Below Rank	A score of 1 indicates a level of performance below that which ordinarily is expected for a faculty member at a particular rank. Faculty who score 1 in a single year evaluation for one faculty role are not eligible to be considered for a DSI regardless of performance in other faculty roles.

[Note 1: When assigning a rubric score, it is possible to give fractional points around a score to account for perceived nuances in the evaluation. Evaluators may add or subtract either .25 or .50 when assigning a score. Scores such as 3.25 (3 + .25) or 4.50 (4 + .50 or 5 - .50), for instance, are equally valid scores to whole number scores.]

[Note 2: When all faculty roles (teaching, scholarship, and service) are evaluated on scales that have been set to a common standard (the notion of “at rank”), scores for those roles can be weighted and combined to achieve a composite score to reflect an overall level of performance. Ordinarily, teaching is weighted .50, scholarship is weighted .30 to .40, and service is weighted .10 to .20. For example, for faculty roles weighted 50% for teaching, 35% for scholarship, and 15% for service, and with rubric scores of 3.00 for teaching, 3.25 for scholarship, and 4.75 for service, the composite score is 3.35 ( $3.00 \times .50 + 3.25 \times .35 + 4.75 \times .15 = 3.35$ ) indicating an overall performance that is somewhat better than “at rank.” QAR faculty who teach four classes and are not required to conduct scholarship ordinarily will be weighted .65 for teaching and .35 for service.]

**The following are two discipline-specific rubrics which will be used to evaluate faculty performance:**

- 1. One set to evaluate junior faculty (clinical assistant professor, visiting assistant professor and assistant professor). Please note, clinical assistant professors are not required to produce scholarship according to college guidelines.**
- 2. The second set will be used to evaluate senior faculty (associate professor and higher).**

## TEACHING EFFECTIVENESS

The department of nursing has identified six components for the evaluation of effectiveness: course design (including syllabi, content and program evaluation), student engagement (including work with students outside of normal class hours, and emphasizing active. Collaborative and /or service learning), students reaction to instruction (reflecting instructional delivery skills), professional development (including both on-and off-campus activities designed to improve teaching), and course management (including all of the administrative tasks associated with teaching a class). [Note: Course management is assessed only by the department chair.] These components are weighted differently and combined to arrive at an overall evaluation of teaching; course design and student reaction to instruction carry the heaviest weights, followed by assessment and students management, while professional development and course management have the lightest weights.

Each component is evaluated separately using a worksheet based on the information which follows. The evaluator assigns a score for each component by circling a point value among the range of points assigned to a particular component (e.g., 0-5 for course content, 0-3 for assessment, ect.). Associated with each component are a series of bulleted activities that evaluators can use to help structure the evaluation. The bulleted activities are not meant to be used as a checklist, rather they should serve as prompts that provide reminders, to both faculty and evaluators alike, as to the kinds of evidence that can be used to demonstrate proficiency in each category. Evaluators should consider the depth and breadth of the evidence in each category and assign a score based on a “holistic” assessment of the component, rather than a more prescriptive, checklist-type, assessment. When evaluators believe that the evidence in any component is consistent with what we might reasonable expect from a faculty member, the evaluator should assign the middle score in the range or the whole number just above the middle score (e.g., a 3 for a 0-5 range) when there is an even number of scores in a range. When the evidence is either above or below that expectation, the evaluator assigns a different score according to his/her judgment.

Once all components have been scored, the point are totaled and converted to a rubric score according to the ranges provided for the personnel committee (based on 18 points maximum) and the department chair (based on 20 points maximum). In cases where all components are scored in the middle of the point range (or just above the middle of the point range), the total number of points will yield a rubric score of 3 (at rank).

## TEACHING

### Single-Year Evaluation for Nursing Faculty

**Course Design:**                      5            4            3            2            1

Evidence for rating includes the following:

- Syllabi are properly developed and include required components
- Course content is current (revised as appropriate) and matched to the level of the class
- Clinical syllabi and course packets are updated annually and contain needed material for this clinical site
- Clinical experiences are appropriate for the level of learning and the area of content
- Completes mandatory competencies and training that allows the instructor to supervise students in the clinical arena
- Assignments and activities are rigorous and contribute to student learning (reading, writing, critical thinking, active and/or collaborative activities are emphasized as appropriate)
- Use of technology is built into course design as appropriate
- Course content includes diverse perspectives and/or cultural competence as appropriate
- Methods and materials are appropriate to class size, level, and content
- New course preparation, new course development (approved by curriculum committee), and/or course conversion to online (or hybrid) format
- Other equivalent course design activities

**Assessment:**                              3            2            1

Evidence for rating includes the following:

- Appropriate tools are used to assess student learning
- Feedback to students is timely and meaningful
- Grading patterns are appropriately rigorous
- Class progress on student learning outcomes is assessed and appropriate steps are taken for continuous improvement (“closing the loop”)
- Indices of student learning/success with direct ties to faculty member
- Positive comments from peers in clinical arenas
- Other equivalent assessment activities

**Student Engagement:**                3            2            1

Evidence for rating includes the following:

- Chairs or serves on undergraduate and/or graduate project (thesis, synthesis, major paper, etc.) committee (beyond teaching load)
- Sponsors independent or directed studies, Honors Thesis, and/or McNair Research Projects
- Involves students in research or service projects outside of class
- Mentors students to publish a paper, present at professional conference, attain employment, or gain admission to graduate school
- Conducts review sessions and/or tutors outside of class
- Promotes student engagement in the clinical setting
- Encourages other equivalent student engagement activities



**Student Reaction to Instruction:      5      4      3      2      1      0**

Evidence for rating is based on IAS scores:

- IAS scores generally <.75 (5 points)
- IAS scores generally <1.00 (4 points)
- IAS scores generally <1.50 (3 points)
- IAS scores generally <2.00 (2 points)
- IAS scores generally <2.50 (1 point)
- IAS scores generally >2.50 (0 points)

**Professional Development:      1      0**

Evidence for rating includes the following:

- Attended at least one CELT presentation on teaching and learning
- Attended a state, national, or international conference in faculty member's field
- Other equivalent professional development activity

**\*Course Management:      2      1      0**

Evidence for rating includes the following:

- All course related deadlines are met, including textbook orders, midterm grades, and final grades
- Regular office hours are maintained and faculty member is reasonably available and responsive to students via e-mail or telephone
- Class meets for the entire scheduled time
- Required clinical hours are met for clinical courses

\*This component of teaching effectiveness is completed by department chair only.

Notes: When assessing course design, assessment, and student engagement, evaluators should assign the "middle score" when they believe the candidate has done an appropriate job for that component given the candidate's rank. Scores above or below the "middle score" should be assigned when the performance is deemed to be above or below expectation. Scores for student reaction to instruction are tied directly to IAS scores. Professional development essentially is scored as a "yes" or "no" answer to the question, "did the candidate pursue professional development related to teaching" during the year in question. Chairs have some latitude in assigning points for course management based on their knowledge of circumstances pertaining to this component.

**APT Committee Evaluation (18 points maximum):**

5	Above Rank	16-17 points from teaching effectiveness worksheet
4	Above Rank	13-15 points from teaching effectiveness worksheet
3	At Rank	10-12 points from teaching effectiveness worksheet
2	At Rank	7-9 points from teaching effectiveness worksheet
1	Below Rank	fewer than 7 points from teaching effectiveness worksheet

**Chair Evaluation (20 points maximum):**

5	Above Rank	18-19 points from teaching effectiveness worksheet
4	Above Rank	15-17 points from teaching effectiveness worksheet
3	At Rank	12-14 points from teaching effectiveness worksheet
2	At Rank	9-11 points from teaching effectiveness worksheet
1	Below Rank	< 9 points from teaching effectiveness worksheet



## **SCHOLARSHIP**

### **Single-Year Evaluation for Junior Nursing Faculty (Assistant Professor)**

5	Above Rank	2 or more refereed papers/publications, and/or book chapters, or Medium grant acquisition, or 2 or more national or international podium/poster presentations, or Re-credentialing in area of area of nursing practice, or Reports that compile and analyze patient programs and health outcomes, or Model program implementation, or Invited manuscript, book, or editorial review, or Member of editorial board for nursing journal, or Local/university awards in recognition of scholarship, or Policy papers designed to influence organizations or governments, or Equivalent level of productivity
4	Above Rank	1 refereed paper/publication, or 1 book chapter, or Small grant acquisition, or Large grant submission (scored well, unfunded), or 1 national or international podium/poster presentation, or State, regional, or local podium/poster presentations, or Invited keynote address, or Maintaining certification in area of specialty area of practice, or Reports that compile and analyze patient programs and health outcomes, or Invited manuscript, book, or editorial review, or Exam question development for certification or state exams, or Equivalent level of productivity
3	At Rank	Presentation at professional meeting, or Publication in conference proceedings, or State, regional, or local podium/poster presentations, or Scholarly product under review or revision, or Documented progress on scholarly product, or Evidence of on-going program of scholarship, or Maintaining certification in area of specialty area of practice, or equivalent level of productivity
2	At Rank	Documented progress on scholarly product, or Evidence of on-going program of scholarship, or Invited manuscript, book, or editorial review, or Equivalent level of productivity
1	Below Rank	Little or no evidence of on-going program of scholarship

## **SCHOLARSHIP**

### **Single-Year Evaluation for Senior Nursing Faculty (Associate and higher)**

5	Above Rank	3 or more refereed papers/publications, and/or book chapters, or Authored or co-authored text, or Edited or co-edited text, or Large grant acquisition, or 3 or more national or international podium/poster presentations, or Development of Significant learning aids (e.g. book Computer software), or Primary author of accreditation report, or Copyrights, licenses, patents, or products for sale, or Equivalent level of productivity
4	Above Rank	2 refereed papers/publications, and/or book chapters, or Medium grant acquisition, or 2 or more national or international podium/poster presentations, or Re-credentialing in area of specialty area of nursing practice, or Reports that compile and analyze patient programs and health outcomes, or Model program implementation, or Invited manuscript, book, or editorial review, or Member of editorial board for nursing journal, or Local or university awards in recognition of scholarship, or Policy papers designed to influence organizations or governments, or Equivalent level of productivity
3	At Rank	1 refereed paper/publication, or 1 book chapter, or Small grant acquisition, or Large grant submission (scored well, unfunded), or State, regional, or local podium/poster presentations, or Invited keynote address, or Maintaining certification in area of specialty area of practice, or Reports that compile and analyze patient programs and health outcomes, or Invited manuscript, book, or editorial review, or Exam question development for certification or state exams, or Equivalent level of productivity

2	At Rank	Presentation at professional meeting, or Publication in conference proceedings, or State, regional, or local podium/poster presentations, or Scholarly product under review or revision, or Documented progress on scholarly product, or Evidence of on-going program of scholarship, or Maintaining certification in area of specialty area of practice, or Invited manuscript, book, or editorial review, or Equivalent level of productivity
1	Below Rank	Little or no evidence of on-going program of scholarship

## SERVICE

### Single-Year Evaluation for Junior Nursing Faculty (Clinical Assistant Professor (Lecturer), Visiting Assistant Professor, Assistant Professor)

- |              |   |
|--------------|---|
| 5 Above Rank | Actively engaged in at least three on-going service activities from at least two different categories with a) evidence of leadership in at least one, b) evidence of effectiveness in all, and c) supported by evidence of involvement with departmental tasks and quality advisement, or, Actively engaged in at least three on-going service activities from three different categories with evidence of effectiveness in all and supported by evidence of involvement with departmental tasks and quality advisement |
| 4 Above Rank | Actively engaged in at least three on-going service activities from at least two different categories with evidence of effectiveness on all and supported by evidence of involvement with departmental tasks and quality advisement, or<br>Actively engaged in at least two on-going service activities from two different categories with a) evidence of leadership on at least one, b) evidence of effectiveness on all, and c) supported by evidence of involvement with departmental tasks and quality advisement   |
| 3 At Rank    | Actively engaged in at least two on-going service activities in any category with evidence of effectiveness on all and supported by evidence of involvement with departmental tasks or quality advisement, or<br>Actively engaged in at least one on-going service activity in any category with a) evidence of leadership, b) evidence of effectiveness, and c) supported by evidence of involvement with departmental tasks or quality advisement   |
| 2 At Rank    | Actively engaged in one on-going service<br>Participates in departmental tasks and provides quality advisement  |
| 1 Below Rank | Not engaged in any service activities outside<br>Does not participate in departmental tasks or advisement   |

\*The phrase “on-going service activities” implies that the service contribution takes place over an extended period of time. As a guideline, service as a member of a committee may be counted as an on-going service activity if the committee meets at least once per month across the academic year and requires some preparation or contribution between meetings. Similarly, service roles as a program coordinator, site accreditation visitor, journal reviewer, or the like may be counted as on-going service activities only if the requirements of that role demand multiple contributions over time. Service activities that do not require multiple contributions over time (e.g., an awards committee that meets once or twice only, a journal reviewer who evaluates a single manuscript, a faculty member who leads a brown bag presentation at CELT, etc.) may be combined during the evaluation process to create equivalents to on-going service activities.

## **SERVICE**

### **Single-Year Evaluation for Senior Nursing Faculty (Associate or Professor)**

- |              |   |
|--------------|---|
| 5 Above Rank | Actively engaged in at least three on-going service activities (or equivalent)* from at least three different categories (departmental, college, university, professional, community) with a) evidence of leadership on at least one, b) evidence of effectiveness (products, outcomes, etc.) on all, and c) supported by evidence of involvement with departmental chores and quality advisement   |
| 4 Above Rank | Actively engaged in at least three on-going service activities from at least two different categories with a) evidence of leadership on at least one, b) evidence of effectiveness on all, and c) supported by evidence of involvement with departmental chores and quality advisement, or<br>Actively engaged in at least three on-going service activities from three different categories with evidence of effectiveness on all and supported by evidence of involvement with departmental chores and quality advisement |
| 3 At Rank    | Actively engaged in at least three on-going service activities from at least two different categories with evidence of effectiveness on all and supported by evidence of involvement with departmental chores and quality advisement, or<br>Actively engaged in at least two on-going service activities from two different categories with a) evidence of leadership on at least one, b) evidence of effectiveness on all, and c) supported by evidence of involvement with departmental chores and quality advisement     |
| 2 At Rank    | Actively engaged in at least two on-going service activities in any category with evidence of effectiveness on all and supported by evidence of involvement with departmental chores or quality advisement, or<br>Actively engaged in at least one on-going service activity in any category with a) evidence of leadership, b) evidence of effectiveness, and c) supported by evidence of involvement with departmental chores or quality advisement   |
| 1 Below Rank | Actively engaged in fewer than two on-going service Activities without evidence of leadership, or<br>Little or no evidence of effectiveness in any service activity, or<br>Failure to participate in departmental chores or failure to provide quality advisement   |

\*The phrase “on-going service activities” implies that the service contribution takes place over an extended period of time. As a guideline, service as a member of a committee may be counted as an on-going service activity if the committee meets at least once per month across the academic year and requires some preparation or contribution between meetings. Similarly, service roles as a program coordinator, site accreditation visitor, journal reviewer, or the like may be counted as on-going service activities only if the requirements of that role demand multiple contributions over time. Service activities that do not require multiple contributions over time (e.g., an awards committee that meets once or twice only, a journal reviewer who evaluates a single manuscript, a faculty member who leads a brown bag presentation at CELT, etc.) may be combined during the evaluation process to create equivalents to on-going service activities.

### **Procedures for Discretionary Salary Increase (DSI) Consideration**

- 1) The APT Committee is charged with the review of all Discretionary Salary Increase (DSI) applications, when available by UUP contract.
- 2) The faculty member wishing to be considered for DSI will submit their entire annual report, and IAS scores for the year that the faculty member wishes to be evaluated. A cover letter asking for DSI consideration and delineating the reasons the candidate believes he/she is qualified should accompany the materials. The faculty member is also asked to complete the standard score sheets for DSI consideration.
- 3) To qualify for consideration for a DSI during a one-year period, a faculty member is expected to present evidence of minimum performance, according to the faculty's rank, in all three areas of teaching, scholarship, and service and present evidence of exceptional performance in at least one area of either teaching, scholarship, or service as defined previously in this document.
- 4) The needed materials should be submitted to the chair of the APT committee by the established deadline.
- 5) APT members independently evaluate each file according to the published criteria and record the evaluations on the standard score sheets.
- 6) APT members review and discuss each file and rank all files according from the most qualified to the least qualified according to a composite score.
- 7) All files are forwarded to the department chair's office along with a copy of the APT summary score sheet for each file.
- 8) Chair conducts an independent evaluation of the file and ranks the files from the most qualifying to the least qualifying according to a composite score.
- 9) The Annual Reports and summary sheets of candidates whose meet or surpass the published standards for DSI are forwarded to the Dean's office for consideration at the Dean's level.

**Multi-year Evaluation Material for Contract Renewal (QAR)**  
**Portfolio Content for the School of Health and Human Performance Personnel**  
**Review File for Contract Renewal**

**Introduction:** Candidates up for contract renewal must submit materials to the APT committee of their home department to initiate the review process. The candidate is responsible for gathering all required evaluative materials. Evaluation materials are due in the fall semester of year two of the currently contracted three year agreement.

***A. Components of the Review File (subject to change by direction of the Provost):***

- The department's portfolio on the candidate is placed in a labeled **manila folder** (no binders) prepared and **handled by the department** (on behalf of the candidate).
- The folder does not belong to the candidate, nor is it returned to the candidate.
- The portfolio includes:
  - An updated vita prepared by the candidate.
  - Copies of the most recent three annual reviews w chair's comments
  - **A Plan of Service**
    - Current plan of service and evaluation of how it has been met
    - Plan of service effective for the next three year contracted term
  - A change of appointment personnel form
  - Copies of the APT review letter (after notification), the Department vote – numerical tally (not seen by the candidate), Chair review letter (after notification), Dean review letter (after notification) and any response statements from the candidate.

**Teaching Requirements for Contract Renewal (65%)**

The faculty member is expected to:

1. Teach a 4/4 course load or contribute more to service by assuming an advisement load greater than usual baseline for the department, assuming a leadership role on at least one committee, assume additional departmental administrative responsibilities, or actively participate on more committees than is the usual departmental expectation or serve on more than one campus-wide or community-wide committee.
2. Have positive evidence of student learning outcomes.
3. IAS scores where at least seventy percent of the individual global questions included in the review period have a mean rating of 1.7.5 or lower. Candidates with IAS scores of greater than 1.75 will need to present evidence of remediation or an active plan of remediation.
4. Have evidence of continued professional development supporting the assertion that the candidate is remaining current in his or her instructional field(s).

**Service Requirements for Contract Renewal (35%)**

The faculty member is expected to actively participate in department and level meetings and be on at least one additional department committee per academic year. He or she is expected to foster the department's relationships with the community agencies where she/he teaches. Faculty at this level are also expected to participate in the college service of SOAR, Saturday Information Sessions, advisement, and registration.



## Multi-year Evaluation Material for Tenure Track Faculty

### Dossier and Portfolio Content for the School of Health and Human Performance Personnel Review File for Contract Renewal, Promotion, and Tenure (Continuing Appointment)

**Introduction:** Candidates for renewal of contract, for promotion, and for tenure prepare and submit materials to their home department to initiate the review process. The candidate is responsible for selecting and organizing materials that demonstrate their productivity in the three areas under review: Teaching, Scholarship and Service.

#### ***A. Components of the Review File:***

##### **1. The Dossier:**

- The department's dossier on the candidate is placed in a labeled **manila folder** (no binders) prepared and **handled by the department** (on behalf of the candidate).
- The folder accompanies the candidate's supplementary materials but does not belong to the candidate, nor is it returned to the candidate.
- The dossier includes:
  - An updated vita prepared by the candidate.
    - Format in reversed chronological order (most recent credits first).
    - Include sections on Education, Professional Certifications/Licensures, Position/Employment History, Scholarly Activity, and Service.
    - Provide one copy to the APT Committee; one copy to the Department secretary for the dossier.
  - Copies of personal statements (teaching, scholarship, service) prepared by the candidate.
    - **Consists of a reflective and objective description/assessment of accomplishments in each area under review (teaching, scholarship, and service to students, to the College, and to the profession).**
    - May be prefaced with a letter to the Department APT Committee requesting review and action (renewal of contract, promotion/tenure or promotion to professor).
    - Format as three separate sections (teaching, scholarship, service).
    - One copy is provided to the APT Committee; one copy is provided to the Department secretary for the dossier.
  - A change of appointment personnel form prepared by the department. Promotion and tenure require a separate form for each action.
  - Copies of the APT review letter (after notification), the Department vote – numerical tally (not seen by the candidate), Chair review letter (after notification), Dean review letter (after notification) and any response statements from the candidate.

**B. Components of Supplemental Materials** Supplemental materials provide evidence of productivity, offer a context for the reviewers, and include evaluative comments on the candidate's work (these should not be solicited by the candidates). Materials should be organized into three-ring or equivalent binders that are clearly labeled. A candidate should not expect individuals reviewing their materials to sift through unorganized and loose materials contained in boxes. A table of contents should also be included to organize the material submitted. The faculty member should also submit a letter to the APT committee expressing their wish to be evaluated,

1. Supplemental Materials for Teaching Effectiveness

- a. Faculty Annual Reports, including comment and signature pages;
- b. Statement of Teaching Philosophy and Focus which contains:
  - i. A written statement on the candidate's philosophy of education and educational goals as they relate to the mission of the department and the mission of the college.
  - ii. A reflective statement indicating how the materials compiled by the candidate demonstrate teaching excellence and continued growth as an instructor.
  - iii. A statement which includes information about courses taught, level of courses, numbers of students, and other pertinent information that will illuminate the context of teaching and supervision and precepting performance. This statement must indicate that the candidate consistently assumes a fair and equitable share of the department's teaching workload.
  - iv. One copy of the candidate's syllabus and/or course packet (from any semester during the review period) for each course taught during the review period.
  - v. One complete set of examinations for one section of each course taught during the review period.
  - vi. Evidence as to the candidate's involvement with course development and/or instructional innovation.
  - vii. Any teaching and practice awards during the review period.

c. Student Outcomes and Accomplishments

- i. Table of grade distribution for all courses taught during the review period, including class size information.
- ii. Sample of student products: care plans, term papers, research projects, etc.
- iii. Scholar's Day presentations.

d. Student Evaluations

- i. Computer printouts of all standardized assessments of teaching (IAS or other) given during the review period.
- ii. Course packet evaluations of courses taught.
- iii. Student written comments from clinical evaluations and IAS evaluations.
- iv. Solicited letters of support from current students and alumni.

e. Peer Evaluations

- i. At least three peer reviews from the classroom, at least one of which must be made by a member of the APT Committee.
- ii. Statement as to the candidate's contribution to the curriculum and

- course development/revision.
- iii. Peer evaluation of course materials used to teach each course during any one semester under the review period.
- iv. Statement and peer evaluation of new innovations of teaching in the classroom
- v. Service as a mentor to novice teachers in the department.
- vi. At least two peer evaluations that attest to the candidate's clinical competence

f. Teaching - Related Activity Beyond the Classroom

- i. Independent/directed studies completed with students during the review period.
- ii. Student involvement in research projects, publications, presentations resulting from individual student/faculty collaboration.
- iii. Statement as to the number of advisees - undergraduate, graduate and RN students.
- iv. Invitations to be a guest lecturer during the review period.
- v. Mentoring of students for C-step or McNair during the review period.

g. Improvement of Teaching

- i. List of all workshops and conferences attended that are pertinent to the discipline of nursing and the area of nursing specialty for the review period.
- ii. Candidate statement of efforts necessary to maintain mastery of subject matter and teaching methodologies.
- iii. Candidate written statement related to improvement in teaching.
- iv. Clinical practice activities during the period of review that assist in the acquisition of new knowledge to be used in teaching with students.

No materials relating to summer teaching are required for inclusion in the portfolio. They may be included, however, at the option of the candidate.

2. Supporting Documents Related to Scholarship

- a. Copies of all manuscripts in pdf format
- b. Copies of books
- c. Copies of letters attesting to completion of scholarship
- d. Lists of citations of the faculty's work
- e. Copies of certification

3. Supporting Documents Related to Service

- a. Letters attesting to completion of service
- b. Documentation of the committees the faculty member has served on divided into department, college, community and profession

## **PROCESS: OVERVIEW OF APPLICATION FOR REAPPOINTMENT, CONTINUING APPOINTMENT, PROMOTION**

1. **Role of the APT Committee:** The APT committee is charged with the review of all applications for personnel procedures within the Department. The review process will consider the performance of the candidate with respect to teaching, scholarship, and service as specified in the following sections. In the event of promotion to the rank of professor, when there are no professors in the department, this process includes:
  - a. Notification of the Dean's office by August 1 of the year of the application review.
  - b. The Dean's office will appoint a professor within the School of Health and Human Performance To join the DON APT Committee
  - c. The chair of the nursing APT committee will assist this newly configured APT committee in the review of the nursing faculty person.
  - d. It is highly suggested that prior to the APT Committee review, the applicant request a professor within the School of Health and Human Performance s to review the application packet for suggestions.
  - e. The above APT Committee will request of the applicant names of colleagues outside the campus that can attest to the quality of scholarship of the applicant, if outside review is to be completed.

The outcome of the APT Committee review process will be a written report and recommendation to the Department faculty. Said report shall include: 1) the Committee's recommendation, 2) the Committee vote on the personnel action being considered, and 3) a supporting narrative summarizing the Committee's conclusions as they pertain to the criteria of teaching, scholarship, and service. In cases where the APT Committee authors multiple reports for multiple candidates, the Committee should seek to produce reports that are consistent in format, style, and organization.

The APT Committee will notify faculty of appropriate appointment dates. This does not absolve the faculty member of keeping abreast of this information.

2. **Role of the Candidate:** Requests by full-time faculty to be considered for re-appointment, continuing appointment, or promotion are to be made in writing to the APT Committee in accordance with current administrative deadlines. It is the responsibility of each individual seeking re-appointment, continuing appointment, or promotion within the Department to prepare a complete and organized package of materials supporting their request. Further, it is the responsibility of each individual to know and understand 1) the terms of their current appointment and 2) application deadlines for re-appointment, continuing appointment, and promotion.
3. **Criteria to be considered:** The report and recommendation of the APT Committee will focus on the candidate's record in the areas of teaching, scholarship, and service as it pertains to the personnel action under consideration. Any application, for re-appointment, continuing appointment or promotion must include a statement by the candidate regarding the relative weights to be applied to the criteria of teaching, scholarship, and service. Each candidate will select a set of weights such that:
  - The weight on teaching should be 0.5 with the possible exception of candidates who have outside grant support for scholarship or service activities.
  - The weight on scholarship should be greater than the weight for service.
  - The sum of the weights is equal to one.

- Those faculty without scholarship expectations will have a weight of 65% teaching and 35% service.

The candidate's right to specify weights in the review process does not remove the obligation of the candidate to meet minimal performance standards in teaching, scholarship, and service as described later in this document.

4. **Application of Criteria Weights in the Review Process:** Members of the APT Committee are charged with applying the weights, as supplied by the candidate, as they consider the candidate's request for re-appointment, continuing appointment or promotion. Each member of the APT Committee is responsible for ensuring that their vote takes into account the weights specified by the candidate.
5. **Distribution of APT Committee Reports:** The APT Committee members are responsible for conducting the review process and preparing their report in conformance with published administrative deadlines. Further, accommodation of a period of review, by the candidate and the Department, must be made as described below.

The written report of the Committee will be shared with the candidate prior to forwarding the report to the Department. The only purpose of sharing the report with the candidate is to allow clarification by the candidate. It is understood that the candidate has the option of withdrawing their request at any time prior to when the recommendation is presented by the Committee to the Department for formal vote, provided that the candidate withdraws their request in writing. The identity of the candidate who chooses to withdraw a request will be kept confidential.

Except in cases where the candidate chooses to withdraw their request for re-appointment, continuing appointment, or promotion, the APT Committee will submit its written report to the Department Chairperson and the Department for the purpose of a departmental vote on the recommendation. The Committee report will be given to the faculty at the next Department of Nursing meeting.

For a reasonable period of time prior to the vote, the candidate's application and supporting documentation, including an inventory of the contents provided by the candidate, will be kept on file in the Department office for examination. Materials removed for examination will be recorded on the inventory. All materials will be returned to the candidate by the appropriate College official or will be retained in the Department office pending disposal.

6. **Voting Process:** The members of the Department vote on the recommendation of the APT Committee. The candidate will be asked to leave the room during this vote. Each full-time and half-time faculty member within the department of nursing will have one vote.

Nursing faculty will have the opportunity to ask questions of the APT Committee and to discuss the recommendations put forward. The members of the Department will then vote by secret ballot. The result will be announced to the Department, and then to the candidate immediately after the balloting, and be recorded in the minutes of this meeting. The Committee's recommendation, along with the Department vote on the recommendation and the Chairperson's recommendation will be forwarded to the Dean.



## **Guidelines for Promotion to the Rank of Associate Professor (with tenure, as appropriate) in the School of Health & Human Performance**

### **General**

- At minimum, faculty must serve 4 years at the rank of assistant professor before applying for the rank of associate professor (unless bringing prior service credit)
- Guidelines pertain to performance since appointment to assistant professor
- Guidelines are not fixed criteria; every portfolio will have unique aspects and evaluators will need to interpret the guidelines, judge equivalencies, and consider special circumstances, where appropriate

### **Teaching**

- Portfolio must include a statement of teaching philosophy and evidence of (including reflective statements on) the following elements (parenthetical “e.g.,” prompts, where provided, are meant to suggest examples of aspects of the teaching elements for which faculty could offer evidence and/or reflection; there is no expectation that all prompts within an element require evidence and/or reflection, but there is an expectation that effectiveness in all elements will be demonstrated in some way):
  - **Instructional delivery** (i.e., IAS scores must be provided for all, or almost all, course sections taught at least over the most recent 5-year period and scores, at minimum, generally should be below 1.75 (candidates with IAS scores greater than 1.75 will need to present evidence of remediation or an active plan of remediation); evidence of teaching excellence may be confirmed by departmental colleagues who are directly familiar with the candidate’s work or augmented by peer review of teaching, as well as letters of support from students; documentation of improvement of teaching
  - **Course design** [e.g., syllabi are properly developed and include required components; course content is current (revised as appropriate) and matched to the level of the class; assignments and activities are rigorous and contribute to student learning (reading, writing, critical thinking, active and/or collaborative activities are emphasized as appropriate); use of technology is built into course design in some way; course content includes diverse perspectives and/or cultural competence as appropriate; methods and materials are appropriate to class size, level, and content; new course preparation, new course development (approved by curriculum committee), and/or course conversion to online (or hybrid) format or evidence of a major contribution to the department or college-wide instructional program; etc.]
  - **Assessment** [e.g., appropriate tools are used to assess student learning; feedback to students is timely and meaningful; grading patterns are appropriately rigorous; indices of student learning/success with direct ties to faculty member; class progress on student learning outcomes is assessed and appropriate steps are taken for continuous improvement (“closing the loop”; indices of student learning or success, etc.)
  - **Student engagement** [e.g., chairs or serves on graduate project (thesis, synthesis, major paper, etc.) committee (beyond assigned teaching load); sponsors independent or directed studies; mentors CSTEP, Honors or McNair students; involves students in research or service projects outside of class; mentors students to publish a paper, present at professional

- conference, attain employment, or gain admission to graduate school; provides excellent academic advisement; etc.]
  - **Professional development** (e.g., CELT, webinars, professional teaching conferences, serves as a faculty or CELT mentor, etc.)
  - **Course management** (i.e., all course-related deadlines are met, regular office hours maintained, reasonable availability to students outside of class, class meets for entire scheduled time, etc.)
  - Documentation supporting mastery of subject matter
  - Student outcomes and accomplishments, including table of courses taught, number of students, grade distributions and interpretations
- When all teaching elements are assessed, the conclusion must be that the candidate is a very good teacher

### Scholarship

- Portfolio must include evidence of publication of no fewer than 4 adjudicated papers (or equivalent)
  - All papers must appear in journals respected in the discipline
  - Regardless of equivalencies suggested below, the candidate must have at least 2 adjudicated papers published in respected journals in the discipline
  - Suggested equivalencies to adjudicated papers for this purpose:
    - One book chapter ("first edition") can count as an equivalent
    - One external grant application that includes indirect costs and has a significant narrative with bibliography can be considered equivalent
    - Peer reviewed Authored or edited books can be considered equivalent to multiple papers (not to exceed 2)
    - Recertification in area of specialty can count as an equivalent
- Portfolio must include evidence of no fewer than 3 presentations (or equivalent) at appropriate state-level or higher professional conferences
  - At least 1 of the 3 presentations must be at the national (or international) level
  - Suggested equivalencies to state-level or higher presentations
    - Two local presentations can be equivalent to 1 state-level presentation or higher (a maximum of 1 time)
- Documentation of other scholarship activities support the applicant's scholarship, such as published conference proceedings, edited books, book reviews, primary authorship of accreditation reports, clinical evaluation practice programs, journal manuscript review, computer assisted instruction materials, book computer software, member of editorial board of national journal, invited scholarly, reports of interdisciplinary programs or service projects, policy papers designed to influence organizations or governments, presentations and keynote addresses, local or university awards in recognition of scholars, journal reviews for peer review journals, reviews of textbook chapters, implemented clinical models,
- When scholarship is assessed, the conclusion must be that quality is good, that productivity likely will be sustained, and that the candidate has the potential to reach the scholarship guidelines associated with the rank of professor

## Service

- Portfolio must include:
  - Evidence of involvement in at least 2 on-going departmental committees/initiatives at least over the most recent 2-year period
  - Evidence of at least 1 leadership role with good outcomes on service-related assignments in the department
  - Evidence of at least 2 on-going committees/initiatives outside the department (and 1 of those activities must be at the college level)
  - Evidence of effective student advisement
  - Evidence of departmental representation at various events (e.g., SOARs, open houses, open registration, community colleges, high schools, commencement, honors and awards ceremonies, etc.)
- When service is assessed, the conclusion must be that the candidate has demonstrated a willingness and ability to participate in departmental governance and the potential to provide effective leadership to the department and beyond



## Guidelines for Promotion to the Rank of Professor in the School of Health & Human Performance

### General

- At minimum, candidates must serve 5 years at the rank of associate professor before applying for the rank of professor
- Guidelines pertain to performance since promotion to associate professor
- Guidelines are not fixed criteria; every portfolio will have unique aspects and evaluators will need to interpret the guidelines, judge equivalencies, and consider special circumstances, where appropriate

### Teaching

- Portfolio must include a statement of teaching philosophy and evidence of (including reflective statements on) the following elements (parenthetical “e.g.,” prompts, where provided, are meant to suggest examples of aspects of the teaching elements for which faculty could offer evidence and/or reflection; there is no expectation that all prompts within an element require evidence and/or reflection, but there is an expectation that effectiveness in all elements will be demonstrated in some way and that applicants for professor can show effectiveness in the prompts that are *italicized*, where appropriate):
  - **Instructional delivery** (i.e., IAS scores must be provided for all, or almost all, course sections taught at least over the most recent 5-year period and scores, at minimum, generally should be below 1.75 (candidates with IAS scores greater than 1.75 will need to present evidence of *remmediation remediation* or an active plan of remediation); evidence of teaching excellence may be confirmed by departmental colleagues who are directly familiar with the candidate’s work or augmented by peer review of teaching, as well as letters of support from students; documentation of improvement of teaching
  - **Course design** [e.g., syllabi are properly developed and include required components; course content is current (revised as appropriate) and matched to the level of the class; assignments and activities are rigorous and contribute to student learning (reading, writing, critical thinking, active and/or collaborative activities are emphasized as appropriate); use of technology is built into course design in some way; course content includes diverse perspectives and/or cultural competence as appropriate; methods and materials are appropriate to class size, level, and content; *new course preparation, new course development (approved by curriculum committee), and/or course conversion to online (or hybrid) format or evidence of a major contribution to the department or college-wide instructional program, etc.*]
  - **Assessment** [e.g., appropriate tools are used to assess student learning; feedback to students is timely and meaningful; grading patterns are appropriately rigorous; indices of student learning/success with direct ties to faculty member; *class progress on student learning outcomes is assessed and appropriate steps are taken for continuous improvement (“closing the loop”)*; indices of student learning or success including external assessment of student or graduate accomplishments that have a direct link to the candidate, etc.)
  - **Student engagement** [e.g., *chairs or serves on graduate project (thesis, synthesis, major paper, etc.) committee (beyond assigned teaching load); sponsors independent or*

- directed studies; *mentors* CSTEP, Honors or McNair students; involves students in research or service projects outside of class; mentors students to publish a paper, present at professional conference, attain employment, or gain admission to graduate school; provides excellent academic advisement; etc.]
  - **Professional development** (e.g., CELT, webinars, professional teaching conferences, serves as a faculty or CELT mentor, etc.)
  - Course management (i.e., all course-related deadlines are met, regular office hours maintained, reasonable availability to students outside of class, class meets for entire scheduled time, etc.)
  - Student outcomes and accomplishments, including table of courses taught, number of students, grade distributions and interpretations
- When all teaching elements are assessed, the conclusion must be that the candidate is a very good teacher and has contributed positively to the instructional program both inside and outside the classroom

## Scholarship

**For those faculty who were at the rank of Associate Professor before April 1, 2013, the following criteria from the previous APT document will be taken into consideration when making decisions about promotion to Professor:** “The Department defines such accomplishment as a minimum of five additional primary scholarly products, three of which must be refereed scholarly journal articles, scholarly monographs or books.”

- Portfolio must include evidence of publication of no fewer than 6 adjudicated papers (or equivalent), at least 2 of which must have publication dates within 5 years of the application
  - All papers must appear in journals respected in the discipline
  - Suggested equivalencies, not to exceed a total of 3 for this purpose, may include the following:
    - Book chapters (“first edition”) can count as up to 1 equivalent
    - Peer reviewed Conference proceedings can count up to 1 equivalent maximum (only if the full paper, not just an abstract, and was reviewed by a multi-person committee)
    - External grant applications that exceeds \$50,000, include indirect costs, and have significant narratives with bibliographies can count up to 1 equivalent maximum
    - Peer reviewed Authored or edited books can count between 1-3 equivalents maximum (points within the range can be assigned in consideration of edition of the book, significance and/or impact of the book, or other relevant factors)
    - Recertification in area of specialty can count as 1 equivalent
- Documentation of other scholarship activities support the applicant’s scholarship, such as published conference proceedings, edited books, book reviews, primary authorship of accreditation reports, clinical evaluation practice programs, journal manuscript review, computer assisted instruction materials, book computer software, member of editorial board of national journal, invited scholarly, reports of interdisciplinary programs or service projects, policy papers designed to influence organizations or governments, presentations and keynote addresses, local or

university awards in recognition of scholars, journal reviews for peer review journals, reviews of textbook chapters, implemented clinical models,

- Portfolio must include evidence of no fewer than 3 national presentations (or equivalent) at appropriate professional conferences, at least 2 of which must have presentation dates within 5 years of the application
  - Suggested equivalencies, not to exceed 1 for this purpose, may include the following:
  - Suggested equivalencies, not to exceed 1 for this purpose, may include the following:
    - Four presentations at local conferences may be considered equivalent to 1
    - Two presentations at state conferences may be considered equivalent to 1
- Documentation of other scholarship activities support the professor's scholarship, such as published conference proceedings, edited books, book reviews, primary authorship of accreditation reports, clinical evaluation practice programs, journal manuscript review, policy analysis, grant submissions and awards less than \$50,000,
- When scholarship is assessed, the conclusion must be that the candidate has produced a "body of work," that productivity has been sustained, that quality is very good, and that the candidate has a national reputation in their field.

### Service

- Portfolio must include:
  - Evidence of on-going involvement in at least 2 committees/initiatives either inside or outside the department each year at least over the most recent 5-year period
  - Evidence of effective student advisement
  - Evidence of continued departmental representation at various events (e.g., SOARs, open houses, open registration, community colleges, high schools, commencement, honors and awards ceremonies, etc.)
  - Evidence that at least 1 service activity since promotion to associate professor was with a national professional organization
  - Evidence of multiple leadership roles since promotion to associate professor with good outcomes (successfully meeting the "charge" or goals of the service activity) on service-related assignments both inside and outside the department
    - At least 1 leadership role must include chairing a departmental committee (or equivalent)
    - At least 1 leadership role in a college-wide committee or activity (or equivalent)
    - At least 1 leadership role must be in community or professional service
- When service is assessed, the conclusion must be that the candidate is a leader in the department and beyond, and contributes in significant and on-going ways to the governance of the department, college, community, and profession

## **Procedure for Adjunct Faculty Review**

**The APT Committee of the Department of Nursing will collect IAS scores annually and conduct a full review of adjunct faculty every 1-3 years. Reviews will consist of the following information:**

- **Annual review**

The annual review is required of all adjunct faculty utilizing IAS forms which are then submitted to the chairperson. The administration and reporting of teaching evaluations for all sections of all courses taught for our department is required. Teaching evaluations are a very important component of our assessment efforts.

If you are teaching a clinical/lab course, you should use IAS Form E when requesting input from students. These evaluations can be obtained from our nursing office personnel. Please discuss the process of administering these evaluation forms with your level coordinator or lead teacher. A copy of the four global items should be submitted to the chairperson to be shared with the APT committee for personnel actions. The chairperson will review the IAS scores and determine the date for a full review pending these results and notify both the APT committee and the adjunct faculty member involved.

- **Full review**

The full review of adjunct faculty members includes IAS scores and a faculty-peer evaluation. Additional input may be requested as needed from level or program directors as well as student interviews, peer feedback and on site staff input.

Level or program directors will be responsible for completing and/or requesting a faculty-peer evaluation from professional staff at the agency where you are placed with students. The evaluation form will be returned to the APT Committee by the level or program director or directly from the staff member who completed the evaluation via a self-addressed stamped envelope.

**The APT committee will keep all documentation on file to be used exclusively for personnel actions and re-appointment. Documentation will be shared with the department chairperson and the APT committee.**

Approved by DON 12/13/13

## References

American Association of Critical Care Nurses (AACN). Missions and values. Retrieved 3/27/09 from <http://www.aacn.org/WD/Certifications/Content/mission-vision.pcms/menu=Certification>.

American Association of Colleges of Nursing. (1999). Position Statement on Defining Scholarship for the Discipline of Nursing. Retrieved 3/30/09 from <http://www.aacn.nche.edu/Publications/positions/scholar.htm>.

Boyer, E. (1990). Scholarship reconsidered: Priorities for the professoriate. Princeton, NJ: The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching.

The Office of the Vice President for Academic Affairs (1999). Guidelines for faculty appointment, renewal, tenure (continuing appointment), promotion, and performance at rank. Brockport, NY: SUNY College at Brockport.

Final revisions and approval: 4/28/06

Reviewed, revised, and approved by DON: 5/12/09

Revised 3/25/12

Reviewed and approved by DON: 4/6/12

Corrections made 4/30/12

Revised 3/26/13

Reviewed and Approved by DON 4/5/13

Revised with Provost's comments 5/23/13

Addition of Adjunct Faculty Review added 12/13/13